Response to Office Action of 10/01/2003 Appl. Ser. No. 10/088,579

## **Amendments to the Drawings**

The label "Prior Art" has been added to Figure 1. Figures 2 and 3 have been re-labeled so that the drawing formerly labeled as Figure 2, is now labeled as Figure 3. Similarly, the drawing formerly labeled as Figure 3, is now labeled as Figure 2. Replacement Drawing sheets have been included as an Appendix to this paper.

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claim 1 has been amended in order to eliminate any possibly ambiguous language. This amendment was made in accordance with the interpretation used by the Examiner in analyzing the patentability of the claims. In addition, one of the preferable phrases removed from claim, involving the embodiment in which the content of microorganisms in the waste-water purification is above 10 g/l, has been added to new dependant claim 23. Accordingly, this amendment does not add any new subject matter. Claims 6-8 were amended in order to provide an antecedent basis for the term "biomass." This amendment does not introduce any new matter. The specification was amended in order to include a topic heading and a brief description of figure 4. Finally, the drawings were amended. Again, the amendments to the specification and drawings do not add any new matter.

## **Objections to the Specification and Drawings**

The Specification was objected to because of the omission of the subject heading "Brief Description of the Drawings," and the purported omission of a brief description of Figure 4. The missing subject heading has been added, and the brief description of Figure 4, which was included in the original application at page 9, line 26, has been added to the paragraph in which all the other figures are briefly described. Thus, these objections have been rendered moot.

In addition, the specification was objected to because the discussion of Figures 2 and 3 was erroneous. Specifically, references to figure 2 should have been made to figure 3 and vice versa. In order to remedy this mistake, the drawings corresponding to Figures 2 and 3 have been amended so that the drawing was formerly labeled as Figure 2 is now labeled as Figure 3, and vice versa. Thus, this objection has also been rendered moot.

Finally, the examiner objected to Figures 1 and 3 (the latter now labeled as Figure 2 as a result of the amendment made herein), claiming that they represented prior art, and did not contain any new subject matter. The applicant traverses this objection. In the description of Figure 2, the specification describes the drawing as a "new implementation of a stable." (p. 9, 1. 7). Thus, the applicant does not concede that what Figure 2 (formerly Figure 3), involves only

Response to Office Action of 10/01/2003 Appl. Ser. No. 10/088,579

that which is old. For this reason, the Applicant traverses the objection to Figure 2 (formerly Figure 3).

## Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, for indefiniteness. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to remove any phrases involving the term "preferably." In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that for purposes of examination, the claim was construed such that the preferable language was not part of the claim. Accordingly, this amendment should not affect the patentability of claim 1.

Claim 6 was rejected for the use of the term biomass. This term has been provided with an antecedent basis. While the Examiner did not reject claims 7 and 8 on this basis, these claims also used the term biomass. Accordingly, an antecedent basis has been added for the term as it occurs in these claims as well. Thus, the Applicant respectfully contends this rejection has been rendered moot.

In the previous Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 1-22 would be allowable if amended in order to overcome the aforementioned rejections. Accordingly, claims 1-23 should now be found in condition for an allowance.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

23552
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: 2/2/04

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C. P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903 (612) 332-5300

Reg. No.: 33,112